

Nashville Patriot.

DAILY 88: TRI-WEEKLY \$6: WEEKLY \$3

AT THE OFFICE OF THE PUBLISHER, 116 BROADWAY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

W. H. SMITH, Editor.

JOHN H. HATCHER, Associate Editor.

Office—No. 16, Broadway Street.

For President, JOHN BELL.

For Vice-President, EDWARD EVERETT.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

For the Electors, JOHN BELL.

Mr. Bell and the Question of Slavery.

While Southern opponents of Mr. Bell, by distorting and perverting his record, are endeavoring to convince the people of the South that he is unworthy of their support, the N. Y. Tribune, and other republican journals, are engaged in an effort to prejudice the people of the North against him, on account of his views upon the subject of slavery, which are the antipodes of those generally held in that section of the Union. The Tribune goes so far as to charge him with complicity in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, by having voted to place in the Kansas-Nebraska bill the clause repealing it, and with voting on other amendments in such way as to show his partiality for the institution of slavery, and then declares that his vote against the bill does not exempt him from the responsibility of having given the votes which, in its eyes, are reprehensible. The St. Louis Democrat, the old organ of the democracy of Missouri, now supporting the Republican ticket, writes on the 18th inst., in an article under the caption of "Bell's Position on the Slavery Question," it says:

The result of the Kentucky election, and the impulse thereby given to the Bell and Everett movement, render it proper that the opinions of Bell on the slavery question should be fully and correctly made known to the public. Nor is this a difficult task. He has served in Congress and Cabinet; he has participated in the great events of the Missouri Compromise, and he has, in his record, been extensive and, judging from a letter of his, recently written and published, he refers to it with pride, and confidently invites its inspection. We think it will be found, on examination, that he is a decided pro-slavery man; that his opinions on the slavery question are identical with those of the Breckinridge Democracy, and not at all with those which were held by the Free and Whig party. True, he has not signed the great Missouri Compromise, but he has signed the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which is the only difference in the premises between him and the Southern Democracy. Neither does he countenance disunion, nor treason, nor secession. His policy is to protect and extend slavery within the Union, without contemplating the alternative of secession in the event of the failure of his measures.

The protection and extension of slavery within the Union is the platform on which John Bell's record establishes him. In the great debate on the Missouri Compromise, in 1820, he argued that slavery is right in itself and beneficial in its operations and results; that it is a necessary and proper institution for the slave; and that the institution is in harmony with the laws of nature. This is sufficiently explicit. Indeed the force of language can no further go in praising the institution. He has not only said this, but he has also said that the Missouri Compromise is a "Missouri compromise," being inconsistent with the principles of non-interference by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850 (commonly called the "Compromise Measures"), is hereby declared imperative and final.

These are the words in which the Missouri Compromise was abolished, and John Bell, of Tennessee, voted for the New York Tribune, as a corollary to a journal in its day as Tribune, now is. The old office-holder seems to have lost his wit as well as his manners; he talks and raves.

OUR CORRESPONDENCE.
COLUMBIA, Aug. 21, 1860.
To the Editors of the Daily Patriot:—Again Col. Thomas McNeill appears in a card, as "Democrat" understood me or he says, "and adds that he is unwilling to be made to say that he did not say." Strange logic that Mr. Mac. You are willing to grant that I understood you (as I did) correctly, yet you are not willing.

Refer "to this matter again" as you may please. I have not one word to retract, but perjure that you did use the language which I reported you as using.

You bring forward five gentlemen to prove that I am in error. I do not know these gentlemen, and I presume they are gentlemen, and men of rectitude. Are they willing to testify positively to your language? Perhaps their recollection is somewhat like that of my young friend Hunter of the Herald in the notes of Whithorne's speech on the 7th of May—that Squatter Sovereignty speech.

Hear more evidence. I introduce John A. Breckinridge, a Breckinridge Democrat. He says: "My brother, I have read the card of Mr. McNeill, and I am sorry to find that he has used the language reported by a 'Douglas Democrat.' It is at least the substance of it; but the language which (McN.) says he used, I am willing to never positively be did not."

Mr. J. D. L. Nunnallee, Breckinridge Democrat, says he did not hear the remark himself, but he thinks he conversed with not less than twenty-five men on the ground, and several of them were Breckinridge Democrats. It is precisely the version which a "Douglas Democrat" did, and that a Mr. —, a lawyer at Centerville, and a Breckinridge Democrat, made use of a remark which I will do Mr. McNeill the courtesy not to state in this connection. Another Breckinridge Democrat came to me immediately after the speaking was over, and said, after a few moments' conversation, "I am in hopes you took no exception to the remarks of the Breckinridge Democrat," remarks, but only considered the source.

Still another Breckinridge man, a "big boss" in the harness—a man whom I greatly admire as a man, as a politician, and as a speaker—a man whom I recognize as a friend, and from that friendship which I bear him, I shall, as it is his wish, still suppress his name—this gentleman said to me the Monday after the barbecue: "Mr. McNeill ought not to have used the language—it was wrong!"

Dr. Wm. Southern, a Bellite, says I reported that Mr. McNeill was not to be made to say "to my political enemy" I have always claimed to be a democrat, a democrat of the Jefferson, Jackson, Polk, and Pierce school. I have never had the privilege of voting but one time in a political contest, and that vote was for Harris, Thomas, McNeill, (God forgive me and I will never make the acknowledgment again), Whitthorne and Gant. That looked somewhat democratic; but now these men have deserted the old ship and are following after the lead of Yancey, Rhetts & Co.—they have quit the democracy and joined the seceders. I am a democrat, and I have no doubt that I will be made in less than twelve months to vote for the local nominees of the democracy, and I for one will be there, but in this contest, being an ardent admirer of Judge Douglas, regarding him as being the greatest and purest patriot and statesman of the present day, and the regular nominee of the democratic party, endeavoring heartily his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, I shall cast my first Presidential vote for him.

I would report him if for no other reason than to lend a helping hand to kill in its infancy that party known as secessionists. I do not charge or believe Breckinridge and Lane are disunionists; nor do I believe that a large majority of his supporters are disunionists; but the party which they represent, for which they bear the colors, has

Mr. Breckinridge to Take the Stump.

The Lexington Statesman publishes the following correspondence: AUGUST 18, 1860.
HON. JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE, Lexington, Ky.: Dear Sir:—Your friends of this Congressional District, have desired you to request you to address the people (at a barbecue) to be given by them to suit your convenience, for the purpose of publicly vindicating yourself from the violent personal assaults made upon you since your nomination for the Presidency at Baltimore.

They have been induced to make this request more particularly, because you have been recently assailed from the "stump" by Judge Douglas, at Concord, and Mr. Crittenden at Louisville; the former charging you with having uttered extreme opinions in favor of "Squatter Sovereignty," and the latter assailing your authority as a Presidential candidate of the National Democracy, you are the head of a disunion party; we wish to afford you the opportunity publicly to repel these assaults, believing that to just man would be disposed to require that you should, by your silence, permit charges so unjust to be promulgated under the authority of these distinguished men. The propriety of this public vindication as false these and other accusations is the most obvious when we reflect, that for the last three years, you have not had the right to speak in the Senate, although by law its presiding officer; and because the obvious motive of these personal assaults is to weaken the confidence of the people in the National and Constitutional Democracy.

Will you permit us to urge you to name an early day when you may suit your convenience to meet and address us. Very truly and respectfully your friends, WILLIAM J. HARRIS, RICHARD HAWES, JAMES R. WARR, ASA MCGRATH, JR., ASA PATINE, L. C. RANALL, J. THOMAS, C. M. JOHNSON, J. H. GARRARD, W. H. VILEY, JAS. P. METCALF, V. M. FLORES, THOS. W. BULLOCK, JAMES WARREN.

LEXINGTON, KY., August 21, 1860.
GENTLEMEN:—I have just received your letter of the 18th inst., in which, on behalf of my friends of this Congressional District, you inquire of me to address the people for the purpose of vindicating myself from the violent personal assaults made upon me since my nomination for the Presidency at Baltimore. I have not proposed at any time to take part in the general political discussions of the day. To this letter, however, I recognize the necessity of my oldest and most cherished friends, whose wishes are with me almost commander; and after some reflection, I have resolved to accept your invitation to appear on the 21st inst., at Lexington, to repel every charge which may be made against me by my neighbors and constituents, but because it may be well to group together and relate, in a public and authentic manner, accusations remarkable for their number, their injustice, and the persistence with which they would be urged against me. I feel that it would be unjust to my principles, my friends, and myself to remain longer in silence beneath this torrent of defamation; and I hope to repel every charge which may be made, to the satisfaction of all candid and honorable men.

It will be gratifying to me to meet my fellow-citizens on any day and at any place that you may select. Very truly yours, JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE.

The Statesman says: His friends have designated the 5th of September as the time for the address, and NEAR LEXINGTON as the place of the meeting.

ALABAMA.—A gentleman from Middle Alabama sends us a list of subscribers, with the remark that one of them "is an old democrat, 80 years of age, who is supporting Bell and Everett with the enthusiasm of youth." The writer is much encouraged by the fine prospects in Alabama.

The Boston Courier says of the New York Tribune: "There is a flavor of very bad whisky about much that appears in the sheet from day to day. The New York Tribune, as a corollary to a journal in its day as Tribune, now is. The old office-holder seems to have lost his wit as well as his manners; he talks and raves."

TO THE EDITORS OF THE DAILY PATRIOT:—Again Col. Thomas McNeill appears in a card, as "Democrat" understood me or he says, "and adds that he is unwilling to be made to say that he did not say." Strange logic that Mr. Mac. You are willing to grant that I understood you (as I did) correctly, yet you are not willing.

Refer "to this matter again" as you may please. I have not one word to retract, but perjure that you did use the language which I reported you as using.

You bring forward five gentlemen to prove that I am in error. I do not know these gentlemen, and I presume they are gentlemen, and men of rectitude. Are they willing to testify positively to your language? Perhaps their recollection is somewhat like that of my young friend Hunter of the Herald in the notes of Whithorne's speech on the 7th of May—that Squatter Sovereignty speech.

Hear more evidence. I introduce John A. Breckinridge, a Breckinridge Democrat. He says: "My brother, I have read the card of Mr. McNeill, and I am sorry to find that he has used the language reported by a 'Douglas Democrat.' It is at least the substance of it; but the language which (McN.) says he used, I am willing to never positively be did not."

Mr. J. D. L. Nunnallee, Breckinridge Democrat, says he did not hear the remark himself, but he thinks he conversed with not less than twenty-five men on the ground, and several of them were Breckinridge Democrats. It is precisely the version which a "Douglas Democrat" did, and that a Mr. —, a lawyer at Centerville, and a Breckinridge Democrat, made use of a remark which I will do Mr. McNeill the courtesy not to state in this connection. Another Breckinridge Democrat came to me immediately after the speaking was over, and said, after a few moments' conversation, "I am in hopes you took no exception to the remarks of the Breckinridge Democrat," remarks, but only considered the source.

Still another Breckinridge man, a "big boss" in the harness—a man whom I greatly admire as a man, as a politician, and as a speaker—a man whom I recognize as a friend, and from that friendship which I bear him, I shall, as it is his wish, still suppress his name—this gentleman said to me the Monday after the barbecue: "Mr. McNeill ought not to have used the language—it was wrong!"

Dr. Wm. Southern, a Bellite, says I reported that Mr. McNeill was not to be made to say "to my political enemy" I have always claimed to be a democrat, a democrat of the Jefferson, Jackson, Polk, and Pierce school. I have never had the privilege of voting but one time in a political contest, and that vote was for Harris, Thomas, McNeill, (God forgive me and I will never make the acknowledgment again), Whitthorne and Gant. That looked somewhat democratic; but now these men have deserted the old ship and are following after the lead of Yancey, Rhetts & Co.—they have quit the democracy and joined the seceders. I am a democrat, and I have no doubt that I will be made in less than twelve months to vote for the local nominees of the democracy, and I for one will be there, but in this contest, being an ardent admirer of Judge Douglas, regarding him as being the greatest and purest patriot and statesman of the present day, and the regular nominee of the democratic party, endeavoring heartily his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, I shall cast my first Presidential vote for him.

very great tendency to sectionalize the Southern States, and this will ultimately result in a dissolution of the Union and the establishment of a Southern Confederacy. Does any man wish such a result? I, for one, answer No. To dissolve this Union to remedy evils would be like the suicide who severs the thread of life to be rid of trouble. If it could be satisfied that the Breckinridge party has not this tendency, I would forsake my present preference for Judge Douglas and vote most cheerfully for Mr. Breckinridge. I do not endorse a disruption of the party upon more personal preferences for men, answer me Hon. John Y. Brown's question: "When you fail to obtain that Constitutional right you insist upon, what will you do about it? Will you submit, or will you secede from the Union, as you did from a democratic Convention?" And until I get an answer—one that responds with a love for the Union—one that holds all sections of the Union on an equality, let the correspondence cease. I am a democrat, and I will be made in less than twelve months to vote for the local nominees of the democracy, and I for one will be there, but in this contest, being an ardent admirer of Judge Douglas, regarding him as being the greatest and purest patriot and statesman of the present day, and the regular nominee of the democratic party, endeavoring heartily his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, I shall cast my first Presidential vote for him.

RICHLAND VALLEY, Bedford Co., Tenn., August 18th, 1860.
EDITORS PATRIOT:—Believing that the friends of the Union are entitled to all the evidences accumulating over our country, of the increasing interest, confidence and zeal that animate the friends of Bell and Everett, and that they should be made to each other words of greeting, I have felt moved to give them a brief report of my recent journey to Lexington, and the pleasure of listening to-day, between Robert Matthews, Breckinridge delegate to Charleston and Baltimore, and Col. Matt. Martin, both of Bedford county, but at Clarksville, in the democratic county of old Lincoln. Mr. Matthews, though not accustomed to public speaking, seems impelled by the distracted condition of his party, to rush to the rescue. The "unintended" are having their apprehensions aroused that they must be prepared for their camps, otherwise, the plain, sober old man of the party would not attempt to take the floor, and turn stump-speakers in their declining years. Mr. Matthews' speech at Clarksville, I think, was his second effort, and as far as earnestness of manner and vehement gestulation are concerned, he is not to be complained of. He first attempted an explanation and justification of his course as a delegate—refused secession, as a principle, and hoped to repel every charge which may be made, to the satisfaction of all candid and honorable men.

After his failure in this, he commenced a general onslaught upon Mr. Bell; deprecated in the most bewailing manner the divisions in the South, and tendered to the Opposition the simple and absurd advice to abandon Bell and Everett and unite on Breckinridge and Lane, as the means for all our ills. His appeals for union contrasted badly with his account of the disruption of the great National Democratic party; and the dependent looks of his friends seemed to indicate the idea that it is hopeless to expect union from the Opposition, when we have sacrificed union among ourselves for a barren abstraction.

Col. Martin took the stand, and recited that the democrats had listened to Mr. Matthews more from courtesy, and a sort of sympathy for his agonizing manner, than for convincing argument and satisfactory explanations, proceeded at once to charge, prove and demonstrate that the clue to the disruption of the democratic party was to be found in the fact, that ultra-radical and reckless men had wrought it for the purpose of dissolving our glorious Union.

Col. Martin submitted such an array of circumstances, facts and arguments, and patriotic strain, that the audience seemed to be held spell-bound. For full two hours he had the most undivided and respectful attention I ever saw paid an Opposition speaker in Lincoln County. It was evident that Col. Martin was showing and proving to the democracy of Lincoln what they had expected Mr. Matthews to do—the causes that had broken up their once great party. Mr. Matthews' explanation or excuse for it seemed to excite pity and despair, while Col. Martin's elucidation of the subject excited astonishment and indignation.

After the dinner, sayings, doings and documents, Col. Martin read the letter of John Mitchell, the Irish exile, recommending his fellow countrymen to favor and support the sectional parties of their respective sections, that the end for which he had labored so long might be accomplished—to wit: disunion. Mr. Matthews (who is also an Irishman) seemed, I hope I may say, mortified at this evidence of disunion from his Irish brother; and while, no doubt, he honestly condemns the sentiment of his brother, it is much to be regretted that he is treating the path laid down in that letter to effect so direful a purpose.

I am satisfied that much good was done, and that old Lincoln, the home of honest G. W. Jones, who did not approve of the secession at Charleston and Baltimore, will give a vasty different report of herself than heretofore.

THE CANVASS IN THE EIGHTH DISTRICT.—Brilliant Speeches of John F. House—A Pass in the Family.

DICKSON COUNTY, Aug. 22nd, 1860.
EDITORS PATRIOT:—I have just heard the candidates for Elector at Sladins Store. Mr. McCANN, the Douglas champion, opened the discussion in a very ingenious and earnest appeal to the Democracy to rally to the nominee of the National Convention. He presented the facts and arguments on his side of the question with decided ability. He is evidently very inexperienced as a political debater, but nevertheless presents the points with ability, and gives entire satisfaction to the Douglas men, of whom there are a considerable number in this neighborhood.

Mr. McCANN, the Douglas champion, opened the discussion in a very ingenious and earnest appeal to the Democracy to rally to the nominee of the National Convention. He presented the facts and arguments on his side of the question with decided ability. He is evidently very inexperienced as a political debater, but nevertheless presents the points with ability, and gives entire satisfaction to the Douglas men, of whom there are a considerable number in this neighborhood.

Mr. McCANN, the Douglas champion, opened the discussion in a very ingenious and earnest appeal to the Democracy to rally to the nominee of the National Convention. He presented the facts and arguments on his side of the question with decided ability. He is evidently very inexperienced as a political debater, but nevertheless presents the points with ability, and gives entire satisfaction to the Douglas men, of whom there are a considerable number in this neighborhood.

Mr. McCANN, the Douglas champion, opened the discussion in a very ingenious and earnest appeal to the Democracy to rally to the nominee of the National Convention. He presented the facts and arguments on his side of the question with decided ability. He is evidently very inexperienced as a political debater, but nevertheless presents the points with ability, and gives entire satisfaction to the Douglas men, of whom there are a considerable number in this neighborhood.

Mr. McCANN, the Douglas champion, opened the discussion in a very ingenious and earnest appeal to the Democracy to rally to the nominee of the National Convention. He presented the facts and arguments on his side of the question with decided ability. He is evidently very inexperienced as a political debater, but nevertheless presents the points with ability, and gives entire satisfaction to the Douglas men, of whom there are a considerable number in this neighborhood.

Mr. McCANN, the Douglas champion, opened the discussion in a very ingenious and earnest appeal to the Democracy to rally to the nominee of the National Convention. He presented the facts and arguments on his side of the question with decided ability. He is evidently very inexperienced as a political debater, but nevertheless presents the points with ability, and gives entire satisfaction to the Douglas men, of whom there are a considerable number in this neighborhood.

Mr. McCANN, the Douglas champion, opened the discussion in a very ingenious and earnest appeal to the Democracy to rally to the nominee of the National Convention. He presented the facts and arguments on his side of the question with decided ability. He is evidently very inexperienced as a political debater, but nevertheless presents the points with ability, and gives entire satisfaction to the Douglas men, of whom there are a considerable number in this neighborhood.

Mr. Breckinridge wished to assume responsibility for the future he could do so in the usual way. He could put an advertisement in the paper giving notice of the dissolution of partnership between him and Judge Douglas, who is alone authorized to settle the debts of the concern. Until such a notice as this is published, the presumption is that the partnership is still existing, and inasmuch as old Bell is notoriously insolvent, Mr. Breckinridge must be looked to as the only responsible member of the firm. This illustration, given in House's best style, had a tremendous effect. By his manner of treating every issue of the canvass is forcible and impressive. He strikes terror into the hearts of the Breckinridge men wherever he speaks, and raises the supporters of Bell and Everett to the highest pitch of enthusiasm. At the close of the speaking, he made an old gentleman, who had been a member of the firm, say: "Sir, if he makes such speeches as that all over the district, Bell will carry it by a larger majority than it ever gave any candidate before."

Mr. Haywood followed in the ordinary democratic style. For particulars, vide the *Union and American* from the 1st of May, 1860, to the 22d of August, inclusive. The principal points in his speech had been anticipated by House, and fell flat and harmless upon the audience. The Breckinridge men were delighted. Mr. Haywood followed in the ordinary